

REMARKS

In view of the amendments listed above and the comments which follow, and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, reconsideration of the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, is respectfully requested by Applicant.

Summary

Claims 1, 10, 20, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Objections

Claim 23 has been amended to correct the minor informality.

Rejections

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10, 12-13, 15, 17-21, and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou (JP08-191256). Claims 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou (JP08-191256) in view of Satoh (US2002/0137471). Claims 2, 11 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou (JP08-191256) in view of Khanna (U.S. Patent 4,649,354). Claims 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou (JP08-191256) in view of Brand (U.S. Patent 5,901,057). Claims 22 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou (JP08-191256) in view of Newman (U.S. Patent 5,224,029).

Claim 1 recites a transmission-and-receiving switching circuit with a first resonant circuit that prevents the transmission signal from attenuating. The first resonant circuit has a series resonant frequency that is about equal to a frequency of a signal other than the transmission signal. In other words, the resonant frequency of the

resonant circuit is not in agreement with frequency of transmission signal to prevent the transmission signal from attenuating.

Katou fails to suggest a resonant circuit that prevents the transmission signal from attenuating. In fact, Katou teaches away from the arrangement of Claim 1 by suggesting that the resonance frequency of the resonant circuit is in agreement with the frequency of the RF signal. Katou fails to suggest anywhere preventing the transmission signal from attenuating. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Katou to prevent the attenuation of the transmission signal. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, independent Claims 10 and 20 are allowable over the cited art for substantially the same reasons as listed above.

Thus, Claim 1, 10 and 20, as well as dependent Claims 2-9, 11-19 and 21-26, are allowable over the cited art.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200